

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are pending in the present application and are rejected.

**Applicant's Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

**Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Calloway et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,146,404).**

As in the Office Action dated July 29, 2005, the pending Office Action again argues that **Calloway** discloses a part retrieving system for production machines utilizing a network as claimed. **Calloway** discloses an electronic maintenance support work station, which serves to replace the use of a paper catalog containing product parts information. See column 1, lines 32-42. In the work station of **Calloway**, part information is recorded on laser disk 15, and subsequently displayed on a graphics screen 14. This information is hierarchically ordered as shown in Figs. 3A and 3B. Once the part required is identified, an order may be placed on the work station computer 24 and transmitted to a central computer 26. See column 4, lines 13-24. **Calloway** also discloses a local database in Figure 1B, with little discussion of its function.

In response to the arguments submitted in the response to the previous Office Action, the pending Office Action states that "the workstation computer 24 is in bi-directional communication with central computer 26, which is depicted in FIG 1A and contains the database part files." Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has misread **Calloway**.

**Calloway** discloses in Figure 1A "a functional block diagram of an electronic maintenance support (EMS) work station," while Figure 1B shows "a hardware block diagram

for the EMS work station.” See Column 2, lines 40-46. In other words, both Figure 1A and 1B illustrate the same EMS work station. This becomes more evident by the fact that the text screen 12, video/graphics screen 14, video/graphics interface hardware 22 and video disk from Figure 1B are also illustrated in Figure 1A. Because Figure 1A is a functional block diagram and Figure 1B is a structural hardware block diagram, not all elements from Figure 1B will be present in Figure 1A, and vice versa.

It is further noted that part files 37, which the Office Action regards as a database, appears to be a component part of part procurement subsystem 28, as illustrated in Figure 1A. According to the specification of **Calloway**, “a parts procurement subsystem 28 can be employed to write an order for the part in the user’s work station computer 24 and transmit it to the central computer 26.” Please see column 4, lines 16-19. Therefore, the Office Action’s assertion that the central computer 26 contains a database is incorrect. Thus, **Calloway** does not disclose “a terminal connected to the part database via a connection network for bidirectional communication with the part database,” as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires that the terminal includes “part information requesting means for requesting said part database to transmit the part information.” In **Calloway**, the machine part information is not *requested* from central computer 26. As discussed above, workstation 24 *places orders* to be sent to central computer 26, but does not *request* machine part information from the central computer 26. Specifically, **Calloway** discloses that an order is “tranmit[ted] [] to the central computer 26.” Please see column 4, line 18-19. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that **Calloway** does not disclose a part retrieving

Request for Reconsideration After Final  
Serial No. 09/880,036  
Attorney Docket No. 010734



system as claimed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art and defines patentable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicant would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicant's undersigned agent.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Ryan B. Chirnomas  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,527  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

RBC/meu